

# **ERC Team**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**CCN: 063965**

**Job No. 22192**

Written Response Required: NO  
Due Date: N/A  
Actionee: N/A  
Closes CCN: N/A  
OU: GW/VZ100  
TSD: N/A  
ERA: N/A  
Subject Code: 4170, 8830/4170

**SUBJECT** GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN STATUS MEETING - DECEMBER 7, 1998

**TO** Distribution

**FROM** Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

**DATE** December 9, 1998

**ATTENDEES**

See Attached List

**DISTRIBUTION**

Attendees  
GW/VZ Distribution List  
Document and Information Services H0-09

**NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING:**

Date: December 21, 1998

Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)

Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

**MEETING MINUTES:**

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Status Meeting was held on December 7, 1998 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**LONG RANGE PLAN (Michael Graham):**

The first thing on the agenda is the Long Range Plan (LRP). We have a copy of the LRP printed and posted on the wall of the meeting room. It was revised and printed today, so it was not possible to get hard copies to the people attending via conference call. It is not something that could be faxed or transmitted electronically. I think what we should do is go over the LRP last, even though we have it listed as the first item on the agenda. That way we can avoid wasting the time of the people on the phone. It would be frustrating for them to listen to a half-hour discussion where I would stand up and point to something that they couldn't see. We should have copies available for interested people to look at by the end of next week.

COMMENT: I (Mike Hughes) would like to add a quick note about the December deliverable. We discussed it briefly in the Policy Work Group meeting today, and I want to make sure that everyone is clear that this is not a decision document. It shows path forward and opportunities for integration. I just think it's important for the entire team to understand that this will show opportunities where decisions will be made, but this is not a decision document.

TWRS TPA NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE (Ecology/DOE):

(Stan Leja – Ecology) In the negotiations this past Friday, it was decided to extend the deadline for one more week. The first full session this week is scheduled for Thursday, with some pre-meetings scheduled as well. Ecology and the Department of Energy (DOE) are still somewhat far apart on a few items. It really boils down to the issues of funding and timelines. The issue with funding is the amount of money and how it translates to actual field characterization. What actions are to be undertaken for the money? The issue with the timeline is that milestones are too far out for Ecology's tastes. We need to address those and shorten the timeframe. There is still a chance that we can come to an agreement by the end of week. We'll take a look at our other options if an agreement doesn't happen. Right now, everything is still up in the air.

(Jim Poppiti – DOE) The only thing I'd add is that I'm a little more optimistic that the negotiations will get done this week. As a result of the meetings last week, Ecology did note that there were improvements in the process and commitments from DOE. As I see it, there are basically three things to resolve. One of them is schedule, as Stan mentioned. Another is a question of legal interpretation. There were some references concerning specific regulatory frameworks that Ecology would like to have included that our attorneys had some problems with. We're hoping to have that worked out this afternoon. There is a conference call scheduled to work this out. The third is finding some way to tie these near term activities with the longer-term things like tank farm closure. We all recognize that this package needs to be hooked into these types of wider issues. If we can resolve those three things, then I'm confident that we'll have an agreement by the end of the week.

QUESTION: Does this settle the final Remedial Field Investigation (RFI) problems?

ANSWER: No. These discussions pertain to phase one of the RFIs. There will be one RFI that will cover Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS) activities and another RFI for the B/BX/BY and S/SX tank farms. We are trying to get some idea of how the subsequent phases of the RFIs will fit into the tank farm closures defined in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA)

AUTHORITY, BUDGET, AND CONTENT LETTERS (Michael Graham):

There were three letters received recently concerning the authority, budget, and content of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project. One was a letter from Under Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz to John Wagoner, the manager of the DOE-Richland (RL) office. One was from James Owendoff, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM), to Wagoner. The third was a letter from Wagoner to Steve Liedle, President of Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI), that also went to all of the contractor principles. The letter from Wagoner to Liedle was discussed in the Policy Work Group.

PROJECT BUDGET UPDATE (Michael Graham):

We haven't received anything formal yet about additional money, but we are expecting in the area of \$4.7 million (M) from the site. This is in addition to the \$2M we already had. That brings the total funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 to \$6.7M. There is also an additional \$10M in science funding that has been identified by DOE-Headquarters (HQ). We are working with them to figure how that money will be allocated between the various science needs.

QUESTION: Does the GW/VZ Project have a priority list similar to the one that the Site Management Board (SMB) uses to allocate funds? Something that they use to identify where money goes when it becomes available?

ANSWER: There was a list early on in the process, but it doesn't have the backdrop on it currently that it will have after the LRP is finished. Priorities currently are based on input we've received from stakeholders, regulators, and others.

QUESTION: You're now saying to yourself "I've \$10M more than I thought I was going to have." How do you identify what you are going to do with that money, and are they things that the stakeholders want done?

ANSWER: It's based on the Detailed Work Plan (DWP) from last summer with the additional used to jump start some of the initiatives that everyone has agreed need to get moving.

COMMENT: During the Policy meeting, a couple of people asked if there was a breakout available of the \$6.7M. It may be good to show a crosswalk in the next meeting. You now have the \$10M plus the \$4.7M plus the original \$2M. It would be good to show where we started and where we are now in order to put us all on the same page. That way we can see where the \$10M will come in, instead of making people dig through the DWP.

RESPONSE: This is a work in progress. Some of the \$10M will be used for some of the other site-wide work.

COMMENT: I just think it would help to see where we are.

RESPONSE: We need to be clear on where the \$10M is coming from. It still has to come back from bid.

QUESTION: What is being bid on?

ANSWER: This money is coming from the Environmental Management Science Program (EMSP). This money can only be used for science. This is a different process than just saying we need X amount of dollars. You have to be open to broader proposals. You need to define what you are most interested in buying before going out shopping.

RESPONSE: The EMSP uses two criteria for allocating funds. One is based on the science itself and the second is based on the relevancy of the proposed work. It's still a little fuzzy on how they fit together.

COMMENT: Science has gone through the Site Technology Consultation Group (STCG) in the past. The next SCTG has needs right down your alley.

RESPONSE: We show some technical insertion points for that kind of thing on our LRP.

COMMENT: The GW/VZ needs a big sheet showing where all of the money is going.

RESPONSE: That's something that we're still sorting through, but most of the added money for FY99 is going into peer review and the System Assessment Capability (SAC).

VADOSE ZONE MONITORING REPORT (PNNL, AUGUST 1998) UPDATE (Doug Hildebrand):

We have the letters of concurrence, and we're ready to issue the report. We're hoping to have it out by

Friday to our distribution. Most people will get it via e-mail. Some people will get hard copies. If anyone would like a hard copy, make sure that we have your names and addresses.

COMMENT: Just to make sure everybody is on the same page, this is the document put out for review by Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) a couple of months ago. It is a statement of proposed work. It was titled “Plan” at that time, and there were some objections, so it was reworked and is now being reissued. The new title is “Proposal for FY99 Vadose Zone Monitoring and Guidance for Subsequent Years for Liquid Waste Disposal Facilities.” It will go out now for a 60-day review.

QUESTION: How is this being made available?

ANSWER: You can contact me (Doug Hildebrand) for a copy, or you can download the document off the web. The document is posted on the web at <http://www.pnl.gov/vadose>. There is also a link to the document from inside the GW/VZ Integration Project website.

REPORT FROM THE HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (Dru Butler):

There was a Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting this past Friday in Portland, and the GW/VZ Integration Project was given time on the agenda. We had a good discussion with the HAB. Bob Alvarez dialed in from DOE-HQ and talked about the authority, budget, and content letters and related issues. He also said a few things about DOE-HQ’s expectations for the GW/VZ Project. Mike Hughes and Linda Bauer briefed the HAB on the LRP and some public involvement issues. Ralph Patt and James Karr represented the GW/VZ Expert Panel, and they took questions from the HAB on the Panel’s role and expectations. We talked a little about the activities planned on-site for the first quarter and linked them together to make sense.

(Mike Hughes) I’d like to add a couple of things. We talked some about risk and how we are dealing with it. Bob Alvarez brought up the fact there are a lot of Policy issues still open, some of them “Big P” and some “small p”. Many of them will be taken care of through defining the decision processes. There are still opportunities for people to get involved on the policy issues. We talked a little about budget, and Bob Alvarez talked about it from a DOE-HQ standpoint.

(Handouts of Linda Bauer’s presentation to the HAB are available by contacting Gary Jewell of BHI at 509-372-9192.)

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY WORK GROUP UPDATE (Fred Mann):

The SAC Work Group met twice last week. We are nearing conclusion of our review of the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) requirements. There are only a couple of fairly small sections left. When we’re done, we’ll start on the next phase to translate them in to an initial study set.

POLICY WORK GROUP UPDATE (Dru Butler):

There was a Policy Work Group meeting today that preceded this meeting. The Policy Group maintains a list of open issues, and we went through that list to make sure that everything is current. The majority of the meeting today was spent discussing the letter on DOE-RL Roles and Responsibilities from John Wagoner. We also discussed the need to hold a Policy meeting concerning regulatory pathways, how regulators and stakeholders can participate in the decision making process, and how regulatory drivers fit in. We touched on the status of issue papers that are open. There was really nothing new to come out of the meeting.

QUESTION: What happens next with the open issue papers?

ANSWER: We'll try to provide answers to the questions they raise, and we'll finalize the papers at the next meeting

QUESTION: I was looking at a couple of the issue papers. They're on some pretty specific stuff. Shouldn't the policy group be concentrating more on generic issues?

ANSWER: Those were drafted for the SAC Group to help them clear a barrier. They asked us to help them with a minutia issue.

COMMENT: I understand that and it's reasonable, but at some point we have to recognize that there are some sensible people working on this Project and not waste time on such small things.

COMMENT: That's one of the things people don't like about the SAC meetings. They're very nit picky.

RESPONSE: That's one of the reasons we went through the issue list and cleaned it up. We want to make sure that we're tackling the bigger items. We're planning on staying on a higher level from here on out.

DECEMBER DELIVERABLE UPDATE (Michael Graham):

We have a working draft built, and we are working on resolving comments from internal reviews now. The goal is to transmit a complete copy to DOE-HQ tomorrow afternoon for their review. The draft we're sending tomorrow is the first time that the Science and Technology (S&T) Plan and Roadmap have been included.

The commitment we have made to DOE-HQ is to have a final draft to them by December 18. After DOE-HQ has their opportunity to review the final draft, it will be released for public review in early January. We are on schedule for that.

The document is in a new format. The old format was scrapped in favor of a format similar to the Strategy document produced for Owendoff. This new format is clearer and makes it easier for us to tell our story.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES VISIT (Jim Hanson):

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) will have a group here on December 15-17. They will be here as a part of a subsurface contamination group. The NAS has invited DOE-RL, as well as Idaho and Nevada, to give presentations on S&T related to subsurface contaminants. On the 16<sup>th</sup>, they will take a tour of the site. They've already held one meeting in Georgia that focused on Savannah River and Oak Ridge. This meeting is to focus on the west.

QUESTION: Is there an agenda available?

ANSWER: I need to get with the NAS on it tomorrow. I hope to have it available by Thursday.

QUESTION: Is it possible to post it on the web when complete?

ANSWER: Yes. We will put it on the GW/VZ website when it's ready.

**LONG RANGE PLAN**

(The meeting adjourned at this point. A small group gathered for an informal walk-through of the current version of the LRP. No minutes were taken for this group.)

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:**

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

**UPCOMING EVENTS:**

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

**NOTE:**

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

**ACTIONS:**

Post agenda for NAS visit on the GW/VZ web site when available.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Marty Bensky, Tri-Cities Caucus

Dru Butler, BHI

Bruce Church, CRE

Shelly Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board

Don Clark, JAI Corp.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River United

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Office of Energy

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL

Owen Goodman, BHI

Dib Goswami, Ecology

Michael Graham, BHI

Jim Hanson, DOE-RL

Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL

Dave Holland, Ecology

Rich Holten, DOE-RL

Mike Hughes, BHI

Richard Jaquish, WDOH

Gary Jewell, BHI

Stan Leja, Ecology

Fred Mann, FDNW

Blaine Marlin, BHI

David Olson, DOE-RL

Tom Page, PNNL

Jim Poppiti, DOE-RL

Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Caucus

Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce

Bob Speed, Ecology

Terri Stewart, PNNL

Herb Sutter, DOE-HQ

Janice Williams, PHMC

John Williams, FDH

Rob Yasek, DOE-RL

**Attachment 1**

*6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*  
**DECEMBER 8, 1998 – JANUARY 18, 1998**  
*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*

<b>December 8-10</b>	System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group Meetings 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – BHI – Room 1B40
<b>December 15-16</b>	System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group Meetings 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – BHI – Room 1B40
<b><i>December 15-17</i></b>	<i>National Academy of Sciences (NAS) visit to Hanford</i>
<b><i>December 18</i></b>	<i>Project Baseline/Long Range Plan submitted to DOE-HQ</i>
<b>December 21</b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room
<b>December 21</b>	Open Project Team Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room
<b>January 4</b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room
<b>January 4</b>	Open Project Team Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room
<b><i>January 12-13</i></b>	<i>Vadose Zone Book Working Meeting Seattle, WA</i>
<b><i>January 18</i></b>	<i>Martin Luther King Day – Federal Holiday</i>
<b>January 19</b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room
<b>January 19</b>	Open Project Team Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. – BHI – Assembly Room